



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/722,280

11/24/2003

Larry E. Curtis

SPL-45/47181-00282USPT

6392

23569

7590

04/04/2006

SQUARE D COMPANY
LEGAL DEPARTMENT - I.P. GROUP
1415 SOUTH ROSELLE ROAD
PALATINE, IL 60067

EXAMINER

LA, ANH V

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2612

DATE MAILED: 04/04/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/722,280

Applicant(s)

CURTIS, LARRY E.

Examiner

Anh V. La

Art Unit

2612

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 December 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-34 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-34 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claim 34 is objected to because in claim 34, line 1, the phrase "said confidence factor" should be changed to - -said confidence value--.

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. Claims 1-9, 11-15, 23-29, 31-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Dickmander.

Regarding claims 1, 23, Dickmander discloses a system/method to determine the direction of a disturbance event in a power distribution system comprising a power feed bus (figure 1), a circuit monitor 22, the circuit monitor being responsive to detect the disturbance event by comparing a disturbance event signal with a pre-event signal on a plurality of time scales (abstract, column 2, lines 1-25, col. 4, lines 1-44).

Regarding claims 2, 24, Dickmander discloses the time scales including a cycle-by-cycle time scale.

Regarding claims 3, 25, Dickmander discloses the cycle-by-cycle time scale being the time for the signal to go through one full cycle (abstract col. 2, lines 1-25, col. 4, lines 1-44).

Regarding claims 4, 26, Dickmander discloses a predetermined portion of the cycle (abstract col. 2, lines 1-25, col. 4, lines 1-44).

Art Unit: 2612

Regarding claims 5, 27, Dickmader discloses an individual point of the cycle (abstract col. 2, lines 1-25, col. 4, lines 1-44).

Regarding claims 6, 28, Dickmader discloses the circuit monitor computing a confidence factor (col. 4, lines 1-40).

Regarding claim 7, Dickmader discloses an alarm channel 60.

Regarding claim 8, Dickmader discloses at least one coincident channel.

Regarding claim 9, Dickmader discloses measuring a voltage disturbance, a current disturbance, and a power disturbance (figure 1).

Regarding claims 11-13, Dickmader discloses an alarm channel 60.

Regarding claims 14, 31, Dickmader discloses a system to determine the direction of a disturbance event in a power distribution system comprising a power feed bus (figure 1), a circuit monitor 22, the circuit monitor determining the direction of the disturbance event and computing a confidence factor (abstract, column 2, lines 1-25, col. 4, lines 1-44).

Regarding claims 15, 32, Dickmader discloses an agreement of voltage, current and power disturbance events (figure 1).

Regarding claim 29, Dickmader discloses a single circuit monitor (figure 1).

4. Claims 33-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Levert.

Regarding claim 33, Levert discloses a method comprising combining (13, 14) confidence values (outputs of 14) from a plurality of networked metering locations 11 in a power system and expressing a confidence in an analysis (figures 1-2).

Regarding claim 34, Levert discloses an agreement of voltage, current and power disturbance events (figure 2).

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dickmander.

Regarding claim 10, Dickmander discloses all the claimed subject matter as set forth above in the rejection of claim 1, and further discloses the monitor measuring a signal to noise ratio and registering a disturbance event, but does not disclose the ratio being greater than 2. However, it would have been obvious to have the ratio being greater than 2 since it is not inventive to discover the optimum or workable ranges by routine experimentation.

7. Claims 16-22, 30, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dickmander in view of Levert.

Regarding claims 16, 30, Dickmander discloses a power feed bus (figure 1), a circuit monitoring 22, each of the branch circuits providing electrical signal to a load, the monitor independently detecting a disturbance event and calculating a confidence factor (abstract, column 2, lines 1-25, col. 4, lines 1-44). Dickmander does not disclose

Art Unit: 2612

a plurality of the branch circuits, each of the branch circuits having a branch circuit monitor. Levert teaches a plurality of the branch circuits, each of the branch circuits having a branch circuit monitor (figures 1-2). It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to include a plurality of the branch circuits, each of the branch circuits having a branch circuit monitor to the system of Dickmander as taught by Levert for the purpose of effectively determining a disturbance event.

Regarding claim 17, Levert discloses combining the confidence factors (fig. 2).

Regarding claims 18-19, Levert discloses calculating the confidence factors by one of the monitors (fig. 2).

Regarding claim 20, Dickmander discloses a power feed bus circuit monitor (abstract, column 2, lines 1-25, col. 4, lines 1-44).

Regarding claims 21-22, Dickmander discloses calculating a system confidence factor (abstract, column 2, lines 1-25, col. 4, lines 1-44).

Answers to Remarks

8. Applicant's arguments filed on December 30, 2005 have been fully considered.

Applicant has argued that Dickmander does not disclose "a plurality of time scales" or "multiple time scales". Applicant's arguments are not persuasive. Applicant's attention is directed to abstract, column 2, lines 1-25, and column 4, lines 1-44, where Dickmander discloses "a plurality of time scales" or "multiple time scales". The previous

cycles and the present cycles are a plurality of time scales or multiple time scales (abstract, column 2, lines 1-25, and column 4, lines 1-44).

Applicant has argued that Dickmander does not disclose "computing a confidence factor for the direction of the disturbance event". Applicant's arguments are not persuasive. Applicant's attention is directed to column 4, lines 1-44, where Dickmander discloses computing a confidence factor for the direction of the disturbance event". Dickmander computes the magnitude of the difference between the present and prior voltage samples, and then compares the computed magnitude of the difference between the present and prior voltage samples to the noise threshold.

Applicant has argued that Levert does not disclose combining confidence values from a plurality of metering locations. Applicant's arguments are not persuasive. Levert clearly discloses a method comprising combining (13, 14) confidence values (outputs of 14) from a plurality of networked metering locations 11 in a power system and expressing a confidence in an analysis (see figures 1-2).

9. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

Art Unit: 2612

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Anh V. La whose telephone number is (571) 272-2970. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri from 9:30am to 6:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Horabik can be reached on (571) 272-3068. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



ANH V. LA
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Anh V La
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2612

AI
March 06, 2006